

REMARKS

Independent Claim 2

Claim 2 recites performing the steps of searching, analyzing and displaying, for processing a received portion of an abbreviated text command being entered by a user. Claim 2 is amended to add the limitation that these steps are performed without the user having entered a delimiter indicating an end to entry of the abbreviated text command.

Both cited references teach away from this limitation, by disclosing systems that process a text command only AFTER the user has entered a delimiter. In the Beauregard reference, the delimiter is a double-space (col. 9, line 9). In the Eide reference, the delimiter is a tab (p. 37, 2nd par.) or an Escape (p. 37, 4th par.). Claim 2 is therefore patentable over the cited prior art.

Independent Claim 37

Claim 37 recites receiving a portion of an abbreviated command being entered by a user, and comparing the received portion of the abbreviated text command to stored abbreviated commands. Claim 37 is amended to add the limitation that the comparing step is performed without the user having entered a delimiter indicating an end to entry of the abbreviated text command.

Both cited references teach away from this limitation, by their systems processing the text command only AFTER the user has entered a delimiter, as explained above. Claim 37 is therefore patentable over the cited prior art.

New Independent Claim 48

Claim 48 recites the steps of receiving a text string being entered by a user, comparing the text string to stored text commands to determine a probable text command, and initiating a corresponding software operation corresponding to the probable text command. Claim 48 includes the limitation that the comparing and initiating steps are performed without the user having entered a delimiter denoting an end of the text string. This limitation is not disclosed by the references of record. As explained above, the systems of Beauregard and Eide process a command only AFTER receiving an end-of-string delimiter. Therefore, claim 48 is patentable over the prior art.

Dependent Claims 3-13, 38-45 and 49-50

The remaining claims all depend from base claims that are explained above to be patentable over the prior art. The limitations that the dependent claims add to the base claims distinguish them further from the prior art. Therefore, the dependent claims, also, are patentable.

The application is therefore now in condition for allowance, and allowance is requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Mitchell Rose (Reg. No. 47,906)
JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Ave.
Cleveland, OH 44114
(216)586-7094

Date: 5/3/07